

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended.

The Examiner has rejected original claims 8 and 15 as being anticipated by Ennis, Jr. Original claim 8 recites the step of “simultaneously displaying information representative of the operation of the system at a plurality of test points to the user, wherein, for each of the test points, information representative of the operation of the system at a plurality of different bandwidths is also simultaneously presented to the user during the displaying stepwherein, for each bandwidth associated with a given test point, a graphical image representative of the operation of the system at the given test point is also presented to the user simultaneously during the displaying step.” Thus, claim 8 requires the **simultaneous display** of system parameters at a plurality of different test points, wherein, for each test point, a graphical image for each of a plurality of different bandwidths is also **simultaneously displayed**. Original independent claim 15 requires similar limitations.

It is respectfully submitted that Ennis, Jr. fails to teach the features in claims 8 and 15 emphasized above. FIG. 11 of Ennis, Jr. (relied upon by the Examiner) displays utilization levels of a single permanent virtual circuit over a period of hours. However, there is no teaching in FIG. 11 of Ennis, Jr. of the **simultaneous display** of system parameters at different test points, wherein a graphical image for each of a plurality of different bandwidths for each test point is also **simultaneously displayed**, as required by claims 8 and 15. Thus, Ennis, Jr. fails to anticipate original independent claims 8 and 15.

In rejecting claims 8 and 15, the Examiner asserted that claims 8 and 15 were similar in scope to original claim 1, and the Examiner failed to therefore provide an independent analysis comparing claims 8 or 15 to Ennis, Jr. Applicant notes that original

claims 1 and 8, 15 differed in scope, in that original claim 1 failed to require the simultaneous display of the parameters discussed above in connection with claims 8 and 15. Since the Examiner failed to provide a separate analysis of claims 8 and 15, the Examiner failed to address in any manner the simultaneous display requirements of claims 8 and 15 in the last Official Action. As discussed above, Applicant maintains that the simultaneous display requirements of claims 8 and 15 distinguish the present claims over Ennis, Jr.

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant has amended this claim to include the simultaneous display requirements discussed above in connection with claims 8 and 15. Thus, for the reasons discussed above in connection with claims 8 and 15, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not anticipated by Ennis, Jr.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that all pending independent claims are in condition for allowance, and that all dependent claims are allowable because each dependent claim depends from an allowable base claim. A Notice of Allowance is therefore earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees due in connection with this filing Deposit Account 50-0310. A duplicate of this authorization is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel H. Golub
Reg. No. 33,701
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1701 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
215-963-5055

Dated: January 7, 2004